

REMARKS

The Examiner now rejects claims 10-19 over previously applied reference Nonoshita et al. (EP 559,376). Independent claim 20 is allowed. The Office Action Summary page mistakenly indicates that claim 20 is objected to.

With respect to independent claims 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18, Applicant submits that these claims describe the transfer of an image-processing parameter for processing an image. Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 describe processing of the image parameter to a second parameter suitable for a second resolution. Nonoshita teaches derivation of an original resolution from lower compressed images, but does not specify image processes in variance with the resolution. Thus, Applicant submits that Nonoshita would include problems of the conventional art, including processing parameters for images that are not suitable for the particular resolution.

In response to the previously submitted argument above, the Examiner alleged in the Office Action dated March 20, 2006:

In response to Applicant's argument that the reference fails to show certain features of Applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., "specifying image processes in variance with the resolution") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant is not relying on a feature of specifying image processes in variance with the resolution, however Applicant is simply pointing out that the teachings of Nonoshita include problems in the conventional art which are addressed by the claimed invention. Further, Applicant submits that Nonoshita does not disclose or suggest the following claimed feature, "said method comprising, when storing or transferring a second image for storage or transfer which has a second resolution for storage or transfer differing from a reference resolution, the

steps of: correcting a reference image-processing parameter set according to a reference resolution image having said reference resolution, based on a difference between said reference resolution and said second resolution, so that it becomes a second parameter corresponding to said second image,” as recited in claim 10 and similarly recited in claims 12, 14, 16, and 18. The underlined portions of claim 10 set forth above relate to the argument above that Nonoshita does not specify image processes in variance with the resolution. At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent claims 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 are not anticipated by Nonoshita.

Further, with respect to independent claim 12, the Examiner appears to believe that “encoded data” corresponds to the claimed “information on a reference image-processing parameter”. However, there is no such “encoded data”. The only such encoded data set forth in Nonoshita is the encoded data C1-C5, and this encoded data relates to the differences between the compressed data and the original data, but does not correspond to the information on a reference image-processing parameter. Thus, the Examiner’s position is not supported by Nonoshita.

In response to the previously submitted argument above, the Examiner alleged in the Office Action dated March 20, 2006:

Regarding claim 4 [these features are now incorporated into claim 12], the Nonoshita reference discloses storing information on a reference image processing parameter, wherein the processing parameter is $C+C1+C2$ wherein $C1+C2$ is information on encoded difference data for converting from 400dpi image to 100 dpi reference image and C is the reference resolution (see column 6, lines 8-42).

In response, Applicant maintains that the variable C does NOT correspond to the reference resolution (contrary to the Examiner’s assertion), however C simply indicates a computed lower resolution of a previously read image. Therefore, since the basis for the

Examiner's argument is inaccurate, Applicant maintains that the Examiner's conclusion that the features of claim 12 are satisfied is not supported by Nonoshita, as the basis for the Examiner's conclusion is not supportable. Moreover, claim 12 describes correcting a reference parameter depending on a difference between the reference and second resolution so that it becomes a second parameter. To the extent variables C1 & C2 stem from an incremental adjustment of a high density image, there is no transfer of such information "along with" said second image. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant maintains that Nonoshita does not disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 12.

Further, with respect to independent claim 14, Applicant submits that Nonoshita does not disclose or suggest at least, "parameter correction means for correcting a reference image-processing parameter set according to a reference resolution image having a reference resolution, based on a difference between said reference resolution and a second resolution for storage or transfer differing from said reference resolution, so that it becomes a second parameter corresponding to a second image for storage or transfer which has said second resolution, "as recited in claim 14. The Examiner appears to believe that the expansion circuit 8 set forth in Nonoshita satisfies the above-quoted element of claim 14. However, nowhere does Nonoshita disclose that the expansion circuit 8 performs the operations of the claimed parameter correction means. At col. 4, lines 21-29, Nonoshita only discloses that the expansion circuit 8 generates compressed encoded image data and expands the compressed image data in the JBIG method. Nowhere, however, are the specific claimed features set forth in claim 14 taught or suggested in Nonoshita.

Further, with respect to independent claim 14, as indicated above with respect to claim 12, the Examiner's argument is based on the inaccurate conclusion that C denotes a reference

resolution, and based on this understanding, the Examiner believes that the features above, including the underlined feature is satisfied by Nonoshita. However, as pointed out above, the Examiner's assertion in this regard is inaccurate. Therefore, Applicant submits that the above-quoted features are not satisfied by Nonoshita, and submits that Nonoshita does not anticipate claim 14.

With respect to claims 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19, in addition to the previously submitted arguments, Applicant submits that Nonoshita does not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein said second parameter comprises a plurality of transform functions and each of said plurality of transform functions respectively corresponds to each image signal of said reference resolution image," as recited in amended claims 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19. The Examiner alleges that col. 6, lines 38-57 and col. 7, lines 4-11 of Nonoshita satisfy the features of claims 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19, as presently recited. Further, the Examiner simply states that the entire image in Nonoshita is transformed or converted by the expansion to the higher resolution. Applicant submits that converting or transforming an entire image does not necessarily denote that a plurality of transform functions are involved. Yet further, even if, *arguendo*, more than one transform function is discussed in Nonoshita, there is no teaching or suggestion that each of said plurality of transform functions would respectively correspond to each image signal of a reference resolution image. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Nonoshita does not anticipate claims 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19.

Applicant maintains that claims 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 are patentable at least based on the arguments set forth in the previous Amendment dated December 27, 2005 and Response dated August 21, 2006, as mentioned above.

At least based on the arguments above as well as those previously submitted, Applicant submits that Nonoshita does not anticipate claims 10-19.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 20, 2007